

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 579

November 16, 1995, 6:24 p.m.
Page S-17170 Temp. Record

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE/Passage

SUBJECT: Conference report to accompany the Department of Defense Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996 . . .
H.R. 2126. Agreeing to the conference report.

ACTION: CONFERENCE REPORT AGREED TO, 59-39

SYNOPSIS: The conference report to accompany H.R. 2126, the Department of Defense Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996, will appropriate \$243.251 billion for the military functions of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1996, which is \$6.9 billion more than requested. Details are provided below.

- Military personnel: \$69.191 billion, including: \$19.948 billion for the Army; \$16.979 billion for the Navy; \$17.156 billion for the Air Force; and \$5.887 billion for the Marine Corps; key provisions include the following: active duty end strength, including the Reserves and Guards, will be 2,416,520; a 2.4 percent pay raise will be given, effective January 1, 1996; and a 5.2 percent increase will be given in the basic allowance for quarters (the President requested a 3.4 percent increase).

- Operation and Maintenance: \$81.553 billion, including: \$18.322 billion for the Army; \$21.279 billion for the Navy; \$18.561 billion for the Air Force; and \$2.393 billion for the Marine Corps; key initiatives include the following: \$322 million will be added to the services accounts to be used solely for the repair and improvement of barracks and housing for single service members; the SR-71 spy airplane will be maintained through FY 1996; \$0 will be provided for peacekeeping (the Administration requested \$65 million); \$1.422 billion will be provided for environmental restoration; and \$300 million will be provided for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (to promote denuclearization and reduce the threat of weapons proliferation in the former Soviet Union).

- Procurement: \$44.069 billion (\$5.407 billion more than requested), including: \$822.7 million for 18 F/A-18 C/D Hornets; \$700 million for the SSN-23 Seawolf submarine; \$2.169 billion for three DDG-51 destroyers; \$1.3 billion for the LHD-7 amphibious assault ship; \$772.9 million for B-2A bomber procurement (thereby keeping the production line open); \$56.3 million for B-1B bomber procurement; \$2.412 billion for eight C-17 transport aircraft; and \$777 million for National Guard and Reserve equipment.

- Research, development, test, and evaluation: \$36.430 billion, including \$745.6 million to accelerate the development of a national missile defense system; \$20.4 million for the Corps surface-to-air missile; and \$195 million for the Technology Reinvestment

(See other side)

YEAS (59)			NAYS (39)			NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans (48 or 91%)		Democrats (11 or 24%)	Republicans (5 or 9%)		Democrats (34 or 76%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (1)
Abraham	Helms	Akaka	Brown	Baucus	Kennedy		Nunn ²
Ashcroft	Hutchison	Breaux	Hatfield	Biden	Kerrey		
Bennett	Inhofe	Feinstein	Jeffords	Bingaman	Kerry		
Bond	Kassebaum	Ford	McCain	Boxer	Kohl		
Burns	Kempthorne	Heflin	Roth	Bradley	Lautenberg		
Campbell	Kyl	Hollings		Bryan	Leahy		
Chafee	Lott	Inouye		Bumpers	Levin		
Coats	Lugar	Johnston		Byrd	Mikulski		
Cochran	Mack	Lieberman		Conrad	Moseley-Braun		
Cohen	McConnell	Reid		Daschle	Moynihan		
Coverdell	Murkowski	Robb		Dodd	Murray		
Craig	Nickles			Dorgan	Pell		
D'Amato	Pressler			Exon	Pryor		
DeWine	Santorum			Feingold	Rockefeller		
Dole	Shelby			Glenn	Sarbanes		
Domenici	Simpson			Graham	Simon		
Faircloth	Smith			Harkin	Wellstone		
Frist	Snowe						
Gorton	Specter						
Gramm	Stevens						
Grams	Thomas						
Grassley	Thompson						
Gregg	Thurmond						
Hatch	Warner						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

Program (the Administration requested \$500 million).

Miscellaneous:

- by October 1, 1995, disbursements in excess of \$5 million will have to be matched to specific obligations before they are made;
- defense contracts will not pay individual contractors in excess of \$200,000 yearly;
- \$647.1 million will be provided for the incremental costs of the on-going operations Provide Comfort and Enhanced Southern Watch (\$569.6 million will come from operation and maintenance funds and the remainder will be drawn from personnel funds);
- none of the funds made available in this Act will be used to administer any policy that permits the performance of abortions at Defense Department facilities (except for abortions necessary to save the life of the mother or for abortions of fetuses conceived by acts of rape or incest);
- it is the sense of the Congress that in the event of a deployment or participation of United States Armed Forces units in any international peacekeeping, peace enforcement, and humanitarian assistance operation, the President must engage in consultations with the bipartisan leadership of Congress and relevant congressional committees; and
- it is the sense of Congress that the Defense Department will not obligate or expend funds for the deployment or participation of United States Armed Forces in any peacekeeping operation in Bosnia-Herzegovina, unless such deployment or participation is specifically authorized by a law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act; this sense of Congress statement will not apply: to the types of operations conducted by United States Armed Forces in Bosnia-Herzegovina during fiscal year 1995; emergency air rescue operations; the airborne delivery of humanitarian supplies; or missions to extract United Nations personnel.

Those favoring final passage contended:

The conference report will provide about \$1.7 billion more for defense than was appropriated in fiscal year 1995. Taking inflation into account, this amount represents yet another decline in real defense spending. If we were to use a current services baselines such as we use for entitlement spending, at least another \$100 billion in spending over the next few years would be needed just to keep our defense forces at their current level, which is already 35 percent below the level of 10 years ago. This decline comes in the face of increased commitments and deployments of our Armed Forces overseas. Currently, there are 241,000 military personnel permanently stationed abroad, not counting the personnel who are on unplanned and frequently unauthorized contingency missions that the President has given them in various trouble spots around the world. In total, the United States is involved in 14 ongoing operations.

In the past few years, we have been slashing procurement, slashing funding for training, and allowing equipment to fall into disrepair and at the same time we have been increasing deployment rates. Armed Forces procurement has dropped by more than 70 percent from 1985 levels, as the Pentagon has entered into what the Congressional Budget Office has called a "procurement holiday." High deployment rates, erosion in pay, little training, and less-than-modern equipment and weaponry have decimated morale among our troops and put them in greater danger when they are sent into conflicts. Some Senators like to say that the United States is the only remaining superpower at the same time as they propose yet more cuts in defense spending in order to pay for more social spending. Except for the United States' nuclear capabilities, this statement will soon no longer be true. Our defense spending is already at its lowest level since right before World War II. We can coast on the defense buildup of the 1980s for only so long. Soon, on a conventional warfare level, the United States will not be a superpower. If our colleagues want to defend vital national security interests abroad, then they are going to have to provide adequate funding.

This bill lays the groundwork for restoring and preserving our defense capabilities, but more is needed. According to recent press reports, General Shalikashvili, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, says that the minimum amount of procurement spending that this bill should provide in order to be able to protect U.S. security interests is \$60 billion. President Clinton requested \$39 billion; this bill will provide \$44 billion. We increased spending in other areas as well. For instance, funding of \$600 million will be provided for ongoing operations. The normal practice is to pay for such operations through supplemental bills, but, because we know that this funding is going to be needed, we think it is more responsible to budget for at least a portion of the expected \$1.3 billion cost ahead of time.

If this bill is followed through on in future years by providing the necessary funding, we can avoid a further hollowing out of our forces. We will still have much smaller forces than we did during the Cold War, in keeping with our lesser commitments, but the forces we have will be well-trained, well-armed, and fully capable of defending national security interests. We strongly support this bill, we urge the President not to veto it, and we will do our best to ensure that future appropriations bills continue the efforts started on this bill.

Those opposing final passage contended:

This appropriations bill spends too much money, especially on unneeded procurement items. Other problems include that it supports deployment of a limited national missile defense system, cuts funding for the Technology Reinvestment Program, and creates a new defense export loan guarantee program. Our main objection is to the excessive procurement spending, though. This

NOVEMBER 16, 1995

VOTE NO. 579

bill is \$6.9 billion over the President's budget request because it contains billions of dollars worth of procurement spending that the Pentagon did not request and does not need. One of the worst outrages is that the House insisted on adding funding to keep the B-2 production line open, with the intention of then building 20 new B-2s in the coming years that will have a total life-cycle cost of \$30 billion. Other procurement outrages include the insistence on buying 6 F-15 fighters, even though the Pentagon did not want any. From helicopters to trucks to tank upgrades to ships to airplanes to ammunition, this bill contains unrequested procurement items. These unrequested, unneeded items are being funded in a year in which our colleagues are drastically cutting spending on education, welfare, and other social services. The President has rightly threatened a veto of this bill. We may not have the votes to stop this bill from passing, but if and when the President vetoes it, we will have the votes to sustain his veto.

Argument 2:

Unlike most Senators who oppose this conference report, we are not motivated by a desire to raid its budget for funds to spend on social welfare programs. We are bitterly, painfully aware of the damage that is being done to this Nation's military, and we are therefore fully supportive of the \$7 billion increase over the President's request. Our opposition, instead, is to the manner in which that increase will be spent. In our opinion, 60 percent of that \$7 billion will be wasted on projects that will do little or nothing to enhance the readiness of our forces today or to modernize our forces to ensure future readiness. Those projects include the Seawolf submarine and the B-2 bomber. Our troops are so overworked that it will soon be impossible to find anyone willing to serve. For instance, the U.S.S. *Inchon* recently returned from a 7-month deployment off the coast of Somalia, and, after 2 weeks rest with their families in the United States, its crew reembarked for a 3-month deployment to Haiti. Our defense capabilities are being stretched to the limit. More funding is desperately needed, and this bill will provide part of the amount that is needed, but it will then waste more than half of it. In protest, therefore, we will vote against this conference report.